

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The final Office Action of July 28, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 7-11, 13, 14, 21 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-5 and 7-22 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested in view of the following arguments.

***Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 1-11, 13, 14 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Woo *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,910,017, hereinafter “Woo”). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claims 1 and 21 relate to, *inter alia*, verifying the integrity of the one or more database files based on validating the archived sales data, wherein the validation occurs prior to the step of formatting the database file into one or more corresponding spreadsheet files. Woo does not teach or suggest such a feature. The Examiner asserts that Woo validates the integrity of sales data by updating a model equation as new data becomes available. In particular, the Examiner states that, “[b]y revising or updating a model equation based on new sales data, it is understood that old data is being replaced because it is no longer the most accurate data available.” Office Action at page 4, lines 23-25. Even assuming, without admitting, that such a process constitutes validating the integrity of sales data, Woo still does not teach validating the integrity of the data *prior to formatting the database files into one or more corresponding spreadsheet files*. For example, Woo discloses that “historical information 12 is converted to a suitable format and may be stored in a relational database.” However, Woo fails to teach or suggest that the historical information is validated prior to conversion to the “suitable format,” or that the suitable format includes a spreadsheet file. As such, claims 1 and 21 are allowable for at least this reason.

Amended independent claim 22 recites, *inter alia*, “prior to exporting the one or more database files, verifying the integrity of the one or more database files based on validating the archived sales data.” Nowhere does Woo teach or suggest such a feature. While Woo describes modifying a model as new actual data on sales becomes available at Col. 8, ll. 46-49, such a process, at most, constitutes importation of data, not exportation. Even if, *arguendo*, the new

sales data is “exported,” Woo lacks any teaching or suggestion that the new actual sales data is validated or verified prior to being exported. Claim 22 is thus allowable for at least this reason.

Claims 2-5, 7-11, 13-14, 19 and 20 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

***Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)***

Claims 12 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woo as applied to claims 11 and 15. This rejection is respectfully traversed. These claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims because the Official Notice, even if correct, does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Woo.

**CONCLUSION**

As noted above, certain claims have been amended and cancelled. These changes have been made without prejudice or disclaimer. While Applicant does not necessarily agree with or acquiesce in the grounds of rejection raised with respect to any claims in the application, in order to expedite prosecution and to facilitate allowance of this application, Applicant makes these claim changes in the present application. Applicant presents these changes solely for the purposes of expediting prosecution and facilitating the immediate allowance of this present application. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue claims of the same or similar scope to the original and/or cancelled claims in this application, e.g., by filing a continuing application.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 16th day of November, 2006

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/  
Chunhsi Andy Mu, Registration No. 58,216

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001